

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A209

NEWS RELEASE FROM AMERICA HAS A RIGHT TO KNOW

(Remarks by Donald L. Jackson, Los Angeles, Calif., on Sunday, January 12, 1964)

This is Broadcast No. 15 in the continuing series, "America Has a Right To Know." Tonight, it will be our purpose to pursue further the question of security in the Department of State, and to put several more respectful questions to the President of the United States. An employee of the Department of State was fired from his position for testifying before a committee of the Congress of the United States—the representatives of the American people—and America has the right to know why.

Mr. President, if you please, sir, two foundation questions.

1. Why did officials of the U.S. Department of State lie, under oath, to a duly constituted and legal committee of the U.S. Congress?

2. Who benefits by the firing from the U.S. Department of State of the security officer, Otto Otepka?

The *Texarkana News*, commenting editorially on the Otepka case, calls it a stench in the State Department. More than 100 American newspapers from border to border and from coast to coast have asked pointed and pertinent questions about the Otepka case, Mr. President, but to this time there has been no satisfactory explanation of the miasmic aura that shrouds the preemptory discharge of the State Department employee, whose crime appears to be that he told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, to a committee of the U.S. Congress, and that his sworn testimony dealt with some off-the-record goings-on in that agency of Government—an agency, Mr. President, for which the Chief Executive has direct responsibility.

In this broadcast, Sir, as in the past, we direct these questions of concern, not from memory, conjecture, nor any desire to frustrate or inhibit, but from official sources in Government—duly recorded and available readily to any citizen who knows where to go to find what he wants—admittedly, not an easy task in a Government such as ours.

In the present instance—the firing of a State Department security officer—we go to a congressional source, Democratic Senator Thomas J. Dobb, of Connecticut, a ranking member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

On November 5, when the Department of State announced the dismissal of Security Officer Otto Otepka (and now we are quoting):

"* * * because he gave the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee information concerning irregularities and probable illegalities affecting the security of the United States."

The Senator from Connecticut presented, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the purging of the last of the old-line security officers to hold a top position in the Department's Office of Security.

We offer that presentation, as a matter of information, as printed on pages 2031 to 2033 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 178 for November 5, together with the comments of Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina. We do this as an integral part of the essential documentation necessary to a public understanding of the questions being asked by many Americans and by more than 100 American editors from coast to coast.

And, Mr. President, America has the right to know.

America has the right to know why none of these questions have been answered by an authoritative voice speaking from the highest levels of our Government.

We offer, sir, as basic documentation for our questions, the following: (1) The five-

part hearings and report on State Department Security, (2) the William Weiland case, and (3) the new passport regulations, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in which appears the testimony of Mr. Otepka concerning alleged irregularities and illegalities in the State Department. These are, of course, sir, official documents of the Senate.

In addition to the foregoing official reports and testimony, we refer to Senator Dobb's subsequent presentations to the Senate on the same subject, with particular reference to the Senator's report to his colleagues on the reaction of the American press to the firing of Otepka. These remarks can be found as printed on pages 24118 to 24142 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, No. 211, of December 20, 1963. Official correspondence between Otto Otepka and his superiors in the Department of State was also included by Senator Dobb, and is detailed on pages 24142 to 24148 of the same date.

Now, sir, we turn to some of the pertinent questions posed by the American press, and dealing with the State Department purge of Otto Otepka because he told the truth, under oath, to a committee of Congress, and ask you, most respectfully, Mr. President, if the American people are not entitled to an explanation from you, sir, about the facts of the matter.

The *Richmond (Va.) News-Leader*, in its issue of October 22, said, and we quote: "Otepka is getting fired because he thought that full security procedures should be followed in evaluating the cases of such prize State Department errors as Alger Hiss, William Arthur Weiland, and John Steward Service. Worse yet, he revealed the laxness to Senate investigators."

Is that charge correct, Mr. President?

The *Monroe (La.) News-Star*, of October 7, 1963, asked editorially, "What sort of cat was Otepka about to let out of the bag?"

The *Chicago Tribune*, on November 7, was more blunt. It said, and we quote: "There can be no doubt that this case reflects an intention by the administration to conduct a purge of patriots."

Is this what is happening, Mr. President? Is that the intention? Is a public employee, who dares tell the truth to a committee of the U.S. Congress, to sacrifice his career—lose his livelihood—or be shunted off to the oblivion of lower Slobbovia?

America and enquiring American editors have the right to know. They are entitled to answers to questions such as this one from the *Perth Amboy (N.J.) News* of November 8, and we quote: "The issue is simple. Can Government agencies work behind closed doors, hidden from the watchful eyes of Congress and the taxpayer?"

Can they, Mr. President? America wants to know—and this, sir, from the same editorial, and we quote again—"What does the Department have to hide? What is the Department afraid of Congress uncovering?"

Following the disclosures on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the *Roswell (N. Mex.) Record* on November 7, said, and we quote: "Why should any information be withheld from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee? How can such a committee operate, unless it has all the facts in hand to judge any case of security violation?"

It is one thing, Mr. President, for labor racketeers, subversives, Communists, and gangsters to invoke the protection of the fifth amendment to prevent incrimination of themselves, but when the Department of State cloaks itself in silence respecting its activities and imposes reprisals against an employee courageous enough to risk the consequences by telling the truth to a committee of the United States Congress, the American people and substantial elements of the American press can be pardoned a feeling of concern and frustration.

The *Evansville (Ind.) Press* of November

13, commenting on the Otepka case, summed up the matter thus, and we quote: "It sounds like a pretty mess at the State Department with one official fired for slipping unauthorized information to Congress, and three others charged for snooping (on) the first man, then denying it to a committee of Congress."

Is there an official answer, Mr. President, to the question asked by the *Greenville (S.C.) News* in the heading of an editorial on the Otepka case, under date of November 9, the *News* asked, and we quote:

"When did this become a crime?"

When did it become a crime, sir, to tell the truth to a Senate subcommittee, under legal subpoena and under the compulsion of an oath? In the same vein, the *Roanoke (Va.) Times* of November 11, captioned an editorial, "Loyalty to Whom," in which it was concluded, and I quote:

"In all this context the issue is not one of loyalty to country but loyalty to a branch of government. If this is to be the case, then, as Vice Chairman Dobb of the Senate Committee charges, the American system of checks and balances in Government is at stake."

Just what did Senator Dobb charge in the Otepka case, Mr. President? He charged, and I quote from his remarks: "Mr. Otepka could be dismissed because he had given honest testimony before the Senate subcommittee on Internal Security, then it would become impossible, or at the best, very difficult, for any congressional committee in the future to obtain uninhibited testimony from executive employees and officials." "The Otepka case," Senator Dobb said, "goes to the heart of security procedures in the Department of State. It has the greatest significance from the standpoint of relations between the legislative and executive branches."

Editorially, the *Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review*, on November 11, put the matter on the line when it charged, and I quote: "Officials lied to nail Otepka."

Mr. President, this flat charge is made against officials of the U.S. Department of State—officials who were given a job to do; by their superiors, of bugging Otepka's telephone and tapping his conversations—officials who later recanted their previous testimony given before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee—changed the character of their testimony in letters remarkably alike, and then departed the State Department scene.

What further action is to be taken in this matter, Mr. President. Are the logical and relevant questions of press and public to be brushed aside by the State Department and a veil of official silence substituted for honest and forthright comment?

America has a right to know.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Until next week at this time, this has been your Capitol Reporter, Donald L. Jackson, bringing you broadcast 15 in the series "America Has a Right To Know," an interrogatory, developed, researched, and produced by Americans who believe that a new and unique form of official fifth amendment usage should be nailed now.

It Is Getting Expensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

A210

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 21

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News, edition of January 13, 1964:

IT IS GETTING EXPENSIVE

At the present time there are several bills before Congress for expansion of the social security program to include medical care for all persons over the age of 65.

If such expansion of the program is approved, the worker and employer taxes which support it are going to be much higher—and as we recently pointed out in these columns, they have been raised nine times since 1949 and are due for automatic further hikes in 1966 and 1968. Any expansion of the program will bring upward tax revisions even beyond those already scheduled.

The costly aspects of the program are becoming more and more apparent as compared with protective programs available through private insurance companies.

Someone has pointed out, for example, that a young man reaching the age of 21 must pay \$174 per year at the present time in social security taxes. By 1966 he will pay at the rate of \$198 a year, and by 1968 it will be \$222. With the addition of more welfare schemes, the rate naturally will go even higher within the relatively near future.

This young man of whom we speak (he could be a son or neighbor right here in Shelby County) will pay this figure for the rest of his life or until he reaches the age of 65. While he is paying, his employer will pay a similar amount.

Now, we are told, if a young man at the age of 21 purchased a life insurance policy with a premium of \$174 a year, he would get \$11,000 worth of protection. It would provide daily protection throughout his life. In addition, he would have a cash value of \$14,144 or \$80 per month for life, whichever he chose, at age 65. With the employer's amount added, he could get \$22,800 worth of life insurance with a cash value of \$29,500 at age 65 or \$180 per month.

Not only would this person have cash protection constantly for his family, he also would have a bankable asset in the policy that he could borrow against if he so desired.

As many predicted, that it would, the social security program is now reaching far beyond the limits originally intended. Our young people who are going to pay the bill for the next 45 years should be the first to oppose any additional costs to this welfare program that has already become more expensive than many dreamed.

A Plea for Medicare**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1964

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, should health care for our senior citizens be an uncertainty or should it be a promise? Should it be a matter of charity or of earned right?

Statistics speak persuasively to the answer—that the need is urgent, that the mechanism is available, that health care financed through the tried and proven social security system is the just, sound, and equitable means of meeting an urgent problem.

But no argument is as persuasive, no statistics call so loudly for action, and action now, than the appeal of thoughtful, self-reliant, individual citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call our colleagues attention to one such appeal I received recently from one of my constituents, Mrs. Ethel Engel, of Oakland, Calif. I have received many similar letters, but this is a good example. As a matter of fact, in a recent poll of my district, over 63 percent of those responding to a legislative questionnaire supported health care for our senior citizens under social security.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can heed these pleas; that we can consider this legislation this year; that we can take this major step toward meeting one of the great unmet needs of our time.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

January 9, 1964.

Hon. Congressman COHELAN: I am writing you to give you my view on medicare and why I think it should be passed immediately.

I am 67 years old and my husband 79, supposedly our golden years. You probably will say, "why didn't you prepare for your older years."

My husband and I have worked very hard during our lifetime. We were in the grocery business and still would have hung on to it, but my husband became very seriously ill, and as if this wasn't enough, a chain store opened at the corner, and that was the end of our business.

At one time we had a very thriving market and a building valued at \$175,000, and we thought at that time we were secure, and along came the depression and just wiped us off our feet. We got back again and made a living, but we never were able to accumulate very much. In the meantime, we put our only son through law school. He is now trying to build a practice and raise a family and we don't want anything from him.

My husband had five operations which were very costly, and if, God forbid, another illness strikes us, we will have to sell an insurance policy, which we are holding onto in the event of death. We belong to Blue Cross and they have paid out a lot of money for these operations, but besides what they paid, we had to pay out a lot too.

I am writing a rather lengthy letter, but I just want to show you how necessary medicare is for people like us, and I am sure there are a great many more like us.

My husband cannot work any longer, but I would like to work. I have had quite a lot of experience in office work and was a very competent stenographer. I have recently taken a refresher course in typing and type very good. I have looked for a typing position to supplement what we are getting from social security, which is a blessing, but to no avail. These are our golden years—worrying what will happen to us.

So you see why I am for medicare and why I think, Congressman COHELAN, representing us from the wonderful State of California, should vote for medicare.

Hoping medicare will pass soon, and my very best wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely,

ETHEL ENGEL.

Los Angeles Presbytery Supports Civil Rights**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased recently to

note the active leadership in the field of civil rights taken by the Los Angeles Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church. The Los Angeles Presbyterians is the official voice of the Presbyterian churches from Santa Barbara to San Diego and consists of a minister and one lay delegate from each church in this area.

I would like to call the attention of all of my colleagues to two resolutions passed recently by the Los Angeles Presbytery, as follows:

Resolved, That the Presbytery of Los Angeles, recognizing the urgent need for national civil rights legislation, recommend to its member churches and individual members of their congregations that they communicate with their congressional representatives to express their support of adequate and effective civil rights legislation.

Resolved, That the Presbytery of Los Angeles affirm its support of current civil rights legislation now in force in the State of California and view with alarm petitions seeking to amend the California State constitution in order to nullify this legislation. We do not deny the right of persons to seek such an amendment, but, in the light of our understanding of law and gospel we cannot agree with such efforts.

New Directions of National Effort**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 21, 1964

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's inspiring and challenging state of the Union message dramatically outlines the broad objectives of national policy of the administration. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commenting on the impact of the President's message:

NEW DIRECTIONS OF NATIONAL EFFORT

The key to President Johnson's program, as outlined in his state of the Union message, is his proposal for a major and historically significant shift from military to civilian welfare expenditures. His projected war on poverty is to be financed by a somewhat slower pace of the cold war. A markedly reduced defense budget, together with economies in some of the old-line activities of Government, is counted on to permit vigorous prosecution of the major elements of the Kennedy domestic program and yet to allow an impressive reduction of the deficit.

Some skepticism as to whether all these desirable objectives can be attained is only natural, but there can be no question that the objectives should be most welcome to the American people. Military spending has been rising fairly steadily ever since 1955, and its demands have placed a ceiling on what could be done to attack the urgent social and economic problems of our society, problems which President Johnson so movingly described in his message.

That a shift of effort from arms to welfare is now possible can only be applauded. The latest Soviet budget also projected such a shift of effort, and so the Johnson program must be regarded as one phase in the continuing process of disengagement, reduction of international tensions, moderation of the